

1 JUDGE FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) NO. CR05-5827FDB  
9 Plaintiff, )  
10 vs. ) ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED  
11 JAMES JEAN FEDERSPIEL, ) MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL  
12 Defendant. ) DATE AND PRETRIAL MOTIONS'  
13 ) DEADLINE

---

14 Upon the stipulation of the parties to continue the trial date in the above-  
15 captioned case, the Court finds that a failure to grant the continuance would deny  
16 counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the  
17 exercise of due diligence, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(ii).  
18

The Court further finds that the ends of justice will be served by ordering a  
continuance in this case, that a continuance is necessary to insure effective trial  
preparation and that these factors outweigh the best interests of the public and the  
defendant in a speedy trial, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).  
22

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the trial date of February 13, 2006 be  
continued to April 17, 2006, and the due date for the pretrial motions be extended to  
February 10, 2006.  
25  
//  
26 //

ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED MOTION  
TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE

1 The period of delay resulting from the continuance of the trial date from February 13,  
2 2006, up to and including the new trial date of April 17, 2006, is hereby excluded for  
3 speedy trial purposes under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A) and (B).

4 DONE this 17<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2006.

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Presented By:  
11 /s/ \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
12 MIRIAM F. SCHWARTZ KENT LIU  
Attorney for Defendant Assistant United States Attorney  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE